arXiv:1409.4656v1 [math.PR] 16 Sep 2014

Embedded Markov chain approximations in Skorokhod topologies

Björn Böttcher*

September 17, 2014

Abstract

In order to approximate a continuous time stochastic process by discrete time Markov chains one has several options to embed the Markov chains into continuous time processes. On the one hand there is the Markov embedding, which uses exponential waiting times. On the other hand each Skorokhod topology naturally suggests a certain embedding. These are the step function embedding for J_1, the linear interpolation embedding for M_1, the multi step embedding for J_2 and a more general embedding for M_2. We show that the convergence of the step function embedding in J_1 implies the convergence of the other embeddings in the corresponding topologies, respectively. For the converse statement a J_1-tightness condition for embedded Markov chains is given.

The result relies on various representations of the Skorokhod topologies. Additionally it is shown that J_1 convergence is equivalent to the joint convergence in M_1 and J_2.

Keywords: Markov chain approximation, Skorokhod space, Jump processes

MSC2010: 60B10 (Convergence of probability measures), 60J05 (Discrete-time Markov processes on general state spaces), 60J75 (Jump processes)

1 Introduction

The space of right continuous functions with left limits plays a prominent role in the theory of stochastic processes. Skorokhod [15] was the first to consider this space with various metrics. He introduced four topologies: J_1, J_2, M_1 and M_2. The main focus in the literature is on the J_1 topology (e.g. [3, 7, 9]) and more recently on M_1 (e.g. [2, 16]). We will be concerned with all four. But note that there are further topologies on the Skorokhod space: e.g. the sequential topology of Jakubowski [10] and the pseudo-path topology by Meyer and Zheng [12].

Given the relations of Skorokhod's topologies one obviously has: convergence in a stronger topology implies the convergence in the weaker topology. But when one starts with discrete time processes there are many possibilities to embed these into continuous time processes. Actually each of the four Skorokhod topologies suggests a particular embedding, the weaker the topology is the 'wilder' the embedding can be (see Section 3). Thus a natural question is: can we switch the topology and the corresponding embedding without losing convergence?

This question is of fundamental interest, since the positive answer removes the need for separate proofs of tightness for each embedding. Note that based on the same motivation Sato [14] discussed a closely related problem: he showed that linearly interpolated Markov chains

*bjoern.boettcher@tu-dresden.de, TU Dresden, Fachrichtung Mathematik, Institut für Math. Stochastik, 01062 Dresden, Germany

converge with respect to the uniform topology (in the space of continuous functions) if and only if the step function embedded Markov chains converge to a continuous process with respect to the J_1 topology (in the Skorokhod space). Our interest in this problem was triggered by the wish to extend Markov chain approximations for Feller processes in J_1 (cf. [6, 4]) to different embeddings, see Remark 4.15. Furthermore we were looking for an easy to use J_1-tightness condition for Markov chains, see Theorem 4.12.

It turns out that in the above setting convergence is always preserved when switching from a topology to a weaker topology, see Theorem 3.2. For the converse direction some additional assumption is needed, see (Counter-)Examples 3.3 and Theorem 4.14.

In the next section we introduce the Skorohod space and the topologies J_1, J_2, M_1 and M_2 in a unified framework. In particular we recall their relations and several representations. The relation between J_1 and the combination of J_2 and M_1 (see Lemma 2.6) seems to be neglected in the literature. It goes back to a remark without proof of Skorokhod [15, 2.2.10-13]. In Section 3 the embeddings are introduced and their relations are discussed. In Section 4 a simple J_1-tightness condition (Theorem 4.12) for embedded Markov chains is presented, it enables us to switch from a weaker to a stronger topology (and to the corresponding embedding; see Theorem 4.14). The paper closes with the proof of Lemma 2.6.

Segments between points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will be denoted by

$$[[x, y]] := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d \,|\, z = \alpha x + (1-\alpha)y \text{ for some } \alpha \in [0,1]\}.$$

The supremum norm is denoted by $\|.\|_\infty$. Limits without superscript, e.g. $f_n \to f$, are meant in the Euclidean distance. Unless stated otherwise, limits are considered for the index tending to infinity, e.g. $n \to \infty$. The dimension $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary if nothing else is stated.

2 The Skorokhod space and its topologies

Definition 2.1.

- *A function $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is right continuous with left limits (rcll) if*

$$f(s+) := \lim_{t \downarrow s} f(t) = f(s) \text{ and } f(s-) := \lim_{t \uparrow s} f(t) \text{ exist in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

- *The Skorokhod space is*

$$D[0,1] := D_d[0,1] := \left\{ f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d \,\middle|\, f \text{ is rcll, and } f \text{ is left continuous at } 1 \right\}.$$

On the Skorokhod space several metrics can be defined.

Definition 2.2. *Let $f, f_n \in D[0,1]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

- *The incomplete graph of f is $\Gamma_f := \{(z,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \,|\, z = f(t-) \text{ or } z = f(t)\}$.*
  The complete graph of f is

$$\overline{\Gamma_f} := \{(z,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \,|\, z \in [[f(t-), f(t)]]\}.$$

We define an order on $\overline{\Gamma_f}$ by

$$(z_1,t_1) \le (z_2,t_2) \text{ if } \begin{array}{l} i)\ t_1 < t_2, \\ ii)\ t_1 = t_2, |f(t_1-) - z_1| \le |f(t_2-) - z_2| \end{array}$$

and the families of parametric representations of $\overline{\Gamma_f}$ are given by

$$\pi(\overline{\Gamma_f}) = \{(u,r) \,|\, u : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d \text{ continuous}, r : [0,1] \to [0,1] \text{ continuous}, \\ (u,r)[0,1] = \overline{\Gamma_f}, (u,r) \text{ is non decreasing.}\},$$

$$\tilde{\pi}(\overline{\Gamma_f}) = \{(u,r) \,|\, u : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d, r : [0,1] \to [0,1], \text{ both cont.}, \\ (u,r)[0,1] = \overline{\Gamma_f}, r \text{ is non decreasing.}\}.$$

- *Set* $\Lambda := \{\lambda : [0,1] \to [0,1] \,|\, \lambda \text{ is bijective}\}$ *and* $\Lambda_c := \Lambda \cap C[0,1]$. *Let* id *denote the identity function on* $[0,1]$ *and set*

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{J_1}(f_1,f_2) &:= \inf_{\lambda\in\Lambda_c}\{\|f_1\circ\lambda - f_2\|_\infty \vee \|\lambda - \mathrm{id}\|_\infty\},\\
\tilde{d}_{J_2}(f_1,f_2) &:= \inf_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\{\|f_1\circ\lambda - f_2\|_\infty \vee \|\lambda - \mathrm{id}\|_\infty\},\\
d_{M_1}(f_1,f_2) &:= \inf_{\substack{(u_j,r_j)\in\pi(\overline{\Gamma_{f_j}})\\ j=1,2}}\{\|u_1-u_2\|_\infty \vee \|r_1-r_2\|_\infty\},\\
\tilde{d}_{M_2}(f_1,f_2) &:= \inf_{\substack{(u_j,r_j)\in\tilde{\pi}(\overline{\Gamma_{f_j}})\\ j=1,2}}\{\|u_1-u_2\|_\infty \vee \|r_1-r_2\|_\infty\},\\
d_{J_2}(f_1,f_2) &:= m_H(\Gamma_{f_1},\Gamma_{f_2}),\\
d_{M_2}(f_1,f_2) &:= m_H(\overline{\Gamma_{f_1}},\overline{\Gamma_{f_2}})
\end{aligned}$$

  where $m_H(A,B) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subset B^\varepsilon, B \subset A^\varepsilon\}$ *is the Hausdorff distance with* $B^\varepsilon := \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,1] \,|\, \exists (y,s) \in B : |x-y| \vee |t-s| \le \varepsilon\}$.

In the following $\mathcal{T}$ will always denote one of J_1, J_2, M_1, M_2. Note that $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a metric on $D[0,1]$. This is clear by the definition for J_2 and M_2, for J_1 see [3] and for M_1 see [16]. For $f, f_n \in D[0,1]$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ we say f_n converges to f in $\mathcal{T}$ (in $\mathcal{T}$-topology), if $d_{\mathcal{T}}(f_n, f) \to 0$. The convergence is denoted by

$$f_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} f.$$

Remark 2.3. Originally Skorokhod used $\tilde{d}_{J_2}, \tilde{d}_{M_2}$ to introduce the topologies J_2 and M_2, respectively. But d_{J_2}, d_{M_2} introduce the same topologies [13, II.4.1 p. 82, II.4.2 p. 83]. Note that on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d > 1$ one could also define a complete graph by including for each coordinate the whole interval between the start and endpoints of the jumps, i.e. $\times_{i=1}^d [[f_i(t-), f_i(t)]]$ where f_i denotes the ith component of f. The definition above only uses the linear interpolation, i.e., $[[f(t-), f(t)]]$, thus here the M topologies are strong in the sense of Whitt ([16] Section 12.3 and 12.10).

The convergence in these topologies can also be characterized by oscillation functions.

Definition 2.4. *(Oscillation functions) Define for* $x, x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned}
J(x,x_1,x_2) &:= |x-x_1| \wedge |x-x_2|,\\
M(x,x_1,x_2) &:= \big|x - [[x_1,x_2]]\big| := \begin{cases} 0 & , x \in [[x_1,x_2]],\\ J(x,x_1,x_2) & , \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

and for $\delta > 0$

$$T_1(\delta) := \{(t,t_1,t_2) \mid (t-\delta)\vee 0 \le t_1 < t < t_2 \le (t+\delta)\wedge 1\},$$

$$T_2(\delta) := \{(t,t_1,t_2) \mid t \in [0,1], t_1 \in [(t-\delta)\vee 0, (t-\delta)\vee 0 + \frac{\delta}{2}], t_2 \in [(t+\delta)\wedge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}, (t+\delta)\wedge 1]\}.$$

The oscillation functions for $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $\delta > 0$ *and* $i = 1, 2$ *are*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{J_i}(\delta, f) &:= \sup_{(t,t_1,t_2)\in T_i(\delta)} J(f(t), f(t_1), f(t_2)), \\ \Delta_{M_i}(\delta, f) &:= \sup_{(t,t_1,t_2)\in T_i(\delta)} M(f(t), f(t_1), f(t_2)), \\ \Delta_U^{\{0,1\}}(\delta, f) &:= \sup_{0<t<\delta} |f(0) - f(t)| + \sup_{1-\delta<t<1} |f(1) - f(t)|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

The following theorem states the fundamental relation of the oscillation functions and the metrics.

Theorem 2.5. *Let* $f_n, f \in D[0,1]$. *Then*

$$f_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} i)\ f_n(t) \to f(t), \forall t \in B, \text{ where } 0, 1 \in B \text{ which is a dense subset of } [0,1], \\ ii)\ \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \Delta_{\mathcal{T}}(\delta, f_n) = 0. \end{array}$$

Proof. The proofs can be found for M_2 in [15, 2.3.4], for M_1 in [15, 2.4.1], for J_2 in [13, II.4.4], [15, 2.5.3] and for J_1 in [15, 2.6.1]. □

Note that the oscillation functions satisfy the following relations.

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $\delta > 0$ *and* $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$. *Then*

$$\Delta_{M_2}(\delta, f) \begin{array}{c} \leq \\ \leq \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \Delta_{J_2}(\delta, f) \\ \\ \Delta_{M_1}(\delta, f) \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \leq \\ \\ \geq \end{array} \Delta_{J_1}(\delta, f) \ \leq \ \Delta_{M_1}(\delta, f) + \Delta_{J_2}(\delta, f). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. The first four inequalities follow directly from the definition of the oscillation functions, since $M(x, x_1, x_2) \leq J(x, x_1, x_2)$ and $T_2(\delta) \subset T_1(\delta)$. The last inequality is proved in Section 5. □

Thus we have the following relations of the convergences

$$M_2 \begin{array}{c} \preccurlyeq \\ \preccurlyeq \end{array} \begin{array}{c} J_2 \\ \\ M_1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \preccurlyeq \\ \\ \preccurlyeq \end{array} J_1 \ \Leftrightarrow \ M_1 + J_2. \tag{2.4}$$

As remarked by Skorokhod [15, 2.2.10-13] there are further equivalent characterizations of the convergence in these topologies.

Theorem 2.7. *Let* $f_n, f \in D_1[0,1]$.

1. M_2 *is characterized by the convergence of the local extrema:*

$$f_n \xrightarrow{M_2} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \inf_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} f_n(t) \to \inf_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} f(t) \text{ and } \sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} f_n(t) \to \sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} f(f)$$

for all t_1, t_2 *being points of continuity of* f.

2. M_1 *is characterized by the convergence of the number of oscillations:*

$$f_n \xrightarrow{M_1} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \nu_{[t_1,t_2]}^{[a,b]} f_n \to \nu_{[t_1,t_2]}^{[a,b]} f$$

for all t_1, t_2 *being points of continuity of* f *and almost all* $a < b$. *Here* $\nu_{[t_1,t_2]}^{[a,b]} f$ *is the largest* k *such that there exist* $t^{(0)} < \ldots < t^{(k)}$ *in* $[t_1, t_2]$ *with* $f(t^{(0)}) \leq a$, $f(t^{(1)}) \geq b$, $f(t^{(2)}) \leq a, \ldots$

3. *J_2 is characterized by the convergence of the first overshoots:*

$$f_n \xrightarrow{J_2} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma^+_{[t_1,t_2],a} f_n \to \gamma^+_{[t_1,t_2],a} f$$

for all t_1, t_2 being points of continuity of f and almost all a. Here, using the convention $\inf \emptyset = 1$, define $\tau_{a,f} := \inf\{t \in [0,1] \mid f(t) \geq a\}$ and

$$\gamma^+_{[0,1],a} f := \begin{cases} f(\tau_{a,f}) - a & , \tau_{a,f} < 1, \\ -1 & , \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and in general use $\gamma^+_{[t_1,t_2],a} f := \gamma^+_{[0,1],a} \tilde{f}$ with $\tilde{f}(t) := \begin{cases} f(t_1+) & , t < t_1, \\ f(t) & , t \in [t_1, t_2], \\ f(t_2-) & , t > t_2. \end{cases}$

4. *J_1 is characterized by the convergence of the first overshoots and the number of oscillations:*

$$f_n \xrightarrow{J_1} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \gamma^+_{[t_1,t_2],a} f_n \to \gamma^+_{[t_1,t_2],a} f \text{ and } \nu^{[a,b]}_{[t_1,t_2]} f_n \to \nu^{[a,b]}_{[t_1,t_2]} f$$

for all t_1, t_2 being points of continuity of f and almost all $a < b$. For the definition of γ and ν see 2. and 3.

Proof. The first and third statement are a consequence of the definition of these metrics via the Hausdorff metric. The second statement can be found in Whitt [16, Thm. 12.7.4, p. 412]. The last statement is due to the equivalence of the convergences (Lemma 2.6): $J_1 \Leftrightarrow M_1 + J_2$. □

Remark 2.8. 1. The above characterizations are tailored to $d = 1$. For higher dimensions Whitt [16, Theorem 12.7.2] showed, for example, that

$$f_n \xrightarrow{M_1} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \eta \cdot f_n \xrightarrow{M_1} \eta \cdot f \text{ as functions in } D_1[0,1] \text{ for all } \eta \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{2.5}$$

for $f_n, f \in D_d[0,1]$.

2. Throughout this section we only considered $D[0,1]$. By replacing 1 by $T \in (0,\infty)$ we have an obvious extension to $D[0,T]$. An approach to define convergence for $f_n, f \in D[0,\infty)$ is

$$f_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f_n\big|_{[0,T]} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} f\big|_{[0,T]} \text{ in } D[0,T] \text{ for all } T \in \{t \mid f \text{ is continuous in } t\}. \tag{2.6}$$

3 Embeddings and approximations

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y^{(n)}$ be a sequence $(y_0^{(n)}, y_1^{(n)}, y_2^{(n)}, \ldots)$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Define for each topology $\mathcal{T}$ the embeddings $x^{n,\mathcal{T}}$ to be functions in $D[0,1]$ such that for $k < n$

$$x^{n,\mathcal{T}}(\tfrac{k}{n}) = y_k^{(n)} \tag{3.1}$$

and for all $t \in (\frac{k}{n}, \frac{k+1}{n})$

$$\begin{aligned} x^{n,J_1}(t) &= y_k^{(n)}, && \text{– step functions for } J_1 \text{ –} \\ x^{n,M_1}(t) &= y_k^{(n)} + (t - \tfrac{k}{n})(y_{k+1}^{(n)} - y_k^{(n)}), && \text{– linear interpolation for } M_1 \text{ –} \\ x^{n,J_2}(t) &\in \{y_k^{(n)}, y_{k+1}^{(n)}\}, && \text{– multiple steps for } J_2 \text{ –} \\ x^{n,M_2}(t) &\in [[y_k^{(n)}, y_{k+1}^{(n)}]]. && \text{– any rcll function for } M_2 \text{ –} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Note that the requirement $x^{n,\mathcal{T}} \in D[0,1]$ ensures that $x^{n,\mathcal{T}}(1) = \lim_{t\nearrow 1} x^{n,\mathcal{T}}(t)$. Clearly in the above definition only those k with $k < n$ are used, but in the next section it will be convenient that each $y^{(n)}$ is a countable sequence.

Lemma 2.6 implies the following result.

Corollary 3.1. *x^{n,J_1} converges in J_1 implies that x^{n,J_1} also converges in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Moreover in a given topology we can always switch between its embedding and the J_1 embedding.

Theorem 3.2. *$x^{n,\mathcal{T}}$ converges in $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if x^{n,J_1} converges in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. By the definition of the metrics and the embeddings

$$d_{J_2}(x^{n,J_2}, x^{n,J_1}) \le \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{M_2}(x^{n,M_2}, x^{n,J_1}) \le \frac{1}{n}.$$

For M_1 we use (2.5) and Theorem 2.7. Note that for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all t_1, t_2 which are points of continuity of the limit and almost all $a < b$

$$\left|\nu^{[a,b]}_{[t_1,t_2]}(\eta \cdot x^{n,M_1}) - \nu^{[a,b]}_{[t_1,t_2]}(\eta \cdot x^{n,J_1})\right| \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} 0,$$

since for $\frac{k-1}{n} < t_1 \le \frac{k}{n}$ and $\frac{l}{n} \le t_2 < \frac{l+1}{n}$ the number of overshoots coincides for the segment from $\frac{k}{n}$ to $\frac{l}{n}$. In the limit no overshoot appears at the two boundary segments since t_1 and t_2 are points of continuity. Thus if the limit is in $D[0,1]$ the statement follows by the triangle inequality. □

We close this section with some basic counterexamples showing that the converse implication of Corollary 3.1 fails.

Example 3.3. Let $n \ge 4$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

1. Let $y^{(n)}_k = 0$ for $\frac{k}{n} < \frac{1}{2}$, $y^{(n)}_k = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{k-1}{n} < \frac{1}{2} \le \frac{k}{n}$ and $y^{(n)}_k = 1$ otherwise. Then x^{n,J_1} converges to $\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2},1]}$ in M_1, but not in J_1 and not in J_2.

2. Let $y^{(n)}_k = 0$ for $\frac{k}{n} < \frac{1}{2}$, $y^{(n)}_k = 1$ for $\frac{k-1}{n} < \frac{1}{2} \le \frac{k}{n}$, $y^{(n)}_k = 0$ for $\frac{k-2}{n} < \frac{1}{2} \le \frac{k-1}{n}$ and $y^{(n)}_k = 1$ otherwise. Then x^{n,J_1} converges to $\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2},1]}$ in J_2, but not in J_1 and not in M_1.

3. Let $y^{(n)}_k = 0$ for $\frac{k}{n} < \frac{1}{2}$, $y^{(n)}_k = \frac{1}{2}$ for $\frac{k-1}{n} < \frac{1}{2} \le \frac{k}{n}$, $y^{(n)}_k = 1$ for $\frac{k-2}{n} < \frac{1}{2} \le \frac{k-1}{n}$, $y^{(n)}_k = 0$ for $\frac{k-3}{n} < \frac{1}{2} \le \frac{k-2}{n}$ and $y^{(n)}_k = 1$ otherwise. Then x^{n,J_1} converges to $\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{1}{2},1]}$ in M_2, but not in J_2 and not in M_1.

4 Convergence of processes and Markov chains

Let $X, X^{(n)}$ $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ be $D[0,1]$-valued random variables on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$. To fix notations we recall the following standard definitions.

Definition 4.1.
- *$X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{E}(G(X^{(n)})) \to \mathbb{E}(G(X))$ for all bounded and $\mathcal{T}$-continuous functions $G : D[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$,*
- *$X^{(n)}_t \xrightarrow{d} X_t : \mathbb{E}(g(X^{(n)}_t)) \to \mathbb{E}(g(X_t))$ for all $g : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ bounded and continuous,*

- $X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} X$ *w.r.t.* $\mathcal{T}$: $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(d_{\mathcal{T}}(X^{(n)}, X) > \varepsilon) = 0$ *for all* $\varepsilon > 0$,
- $X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{fdd} X$ *on* I : $(X^{(n)}_{t_1}, \dots, X^{(n)}_{t_k}) \xrightarrow{d} (X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k})$ *for all* $t_1, \dots, t_k \in I$,
- $(X^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is* $\mathcal{T}$*-tight: for all* $\varepsilon > 0$ *exists a* $\mathcal{T}$*-compact set* $K \in \mathcal{B}(D[0,1])$ *such that* $\sup_n \mathbb{P}(X^{(n)} \in K^c) \le \varepsilon$,
- $(X^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is relative* $\mathcal{T}$*-compact: for every subsequence exists a further subsequence* $(X^{(n_{k_l})})_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ *and a* $D[0,1]$*-valued random variable* Y *such that* $X^{(n_{k_l})} \xrightarrow{d} Y$ *w.r.t.* $\mathcal{T}$.

The following result is the standard tool to handle convergence on $D[0,1]$. We include a sketch of the proof since we are going to point out a particular detail later.

Theorem 4.2.

$$X^n \xrightarrow{d} X \text{ w.r.t. } \mathcal{T} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \textit{i) } X^n \xrightarrow{fdd} X \textit{ on a dense subset of } [0,1], \\ \textit{ii) } (X^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \textit{ is relatively } \mathcal{T}\textit{-compact.} \end{array}$$

Proof. "$\Leftarrow$": By ii) every subsequence of X^n has a converging subsequence whose limit has by i) the same finite dimensional distributions as X. The finite dimensional distributions define uniquely the distribution of a process in $D[0,1]$, thus the limit is X.

"$\Rightarrow$": The projection $\pi_t : D[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $\pi_t(f) := f(t)$ is measurable, $X^n \xrightarrow{d} X$ and the set $T := \{t : \mathbb{P}(|X_t - X_{t-}|) > 0\}$ is countable. Thus for all $t \in T^c$

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in \{f : \pi_t(f) \text{ is discontinous at t}\}) = \mathbb{P}(|X_t - X_{t-}| > 0) = 0$$

and the statement follows by a continuous mapping theorem, e.g. [16, Theorem 3.4.3]. □

Remark 4.3. 1. A sufficient condition for relative $\mathcal{T}$-compactness is given by Prohorov's Theorem:

$$\mathcal{T}\text{-tightness} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{relative } \mathcal{T}\text{-compactness.}$$

The converse holds if $D[0,1]$ with the topology induced by $d_{\mathcal{T}}$ is complete and separable. This is the case for J_1 and M_1, but for J_2 and M_2 it is still an open problem. To avoid confusion, note that the metric spaces $(D[0,1], d_{J_1})$ and $(D[0,1], d_{M_1})$ are not complete - but there exist complete metrics which generate the same topologies (one approach to construct these complete metrics is to add to the given metrics the Lévy distance of distributions obtained via the oscillation functions; see Section 12.8 in [16]).

2. Looking at the proof of Theorem 4.2 (see also [9, Theorem 3.14]) note that if the process X is stochastically continuous, i.e.,

$$\forall s \in [0,1]\ \forall \varepsilon > 0 : \lim_{t\to s} \mathbb{P}(|X_t - X_s| > \varepsilon) = 0, \tag{4.1}$$

then the dense subset of $[0,1]$ can be taken to be the whole set $[0,1]$. See also Proposition 4.8 below.

3. A necessary condition for $X^n \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0\ \exists R > 0 : \sup_n \mathbb{P}(\|X^{(n)}\|_\infty \ge R) < \varepsilon, \tag{4.2}$$

since otherwise some mass would dissipate and hence X would have, with positive probability, values not in $D[0,1]$.

For J_1 there are several conditions for tightness, we will start with a standard result (see e.g. [9, Theorem 3.21]).

Theorem 4.4. *The sequence of processes $(X^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is J_1-tight if and only if (4.2) holds and*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : \ \lim_{\delta\downarrow 0} \sup_n \mathbb{P}\left(\Delta_{J_1}(\delta, X^{(n)}) + \Delta_U^{\{0,1\}}(\delta, X^{(n)}) > \varepsilon\right) = 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Remark 4.5. For M_1 a result analogous to Theorem 4.4 holds (cf. [16, Theorem 12.12.3]). For M_2 and J_2 the corresponding version of condition (4.3) is not necessary for compactness (cf. [15, 2.7.2-4]).

A well known sufficient J_1-tightness condition is due to Aldous [1].

Theorem 4.6 (Aldous [1])**.** *The sequence of processes $(X^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is J_1-tight if*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : \ \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(|X^{(n)}_{(\tau_n+t_n)\wedge 1} - X^{(n)}_{\tau_n}| > \varepsilon\right) = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

for all sequences $(\tau_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, with τ_n being a stopping time for $X^{(n)}$, and all sequences $(t_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $t_n \geq 0$, $t_n \to 0$.

As motivation we also recall a closely related result by Gikhman and Skorokhod [8, Theorem 4, p. 431] formulated here for the time homogeneous setting:

Theorem 4.7 (Gikhman, Skorokhod [8])**.** *Let the processes $X, X^{(n)}$ be time homogeneous Markov processes with $X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{fdd} X$ on some dense subset of $[0,1]$ and*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 : \ \lim_{h\downarrow 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{R}^d \\ t\leq h}} \mathbb{P}\left(|X^{(n)}_t - x| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, X^{(n)}_0 = x\right) = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

then $X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. J_1.

Thus (4.5) is a J_1-tightness condition, actually ensuring that the limit is spatial-uniformly stochastically continuous from the right. Aldous tightness condition and condition (4.5) are not necessary for convergence, a counterexample is a process with a fixed jump, e.g. consider the deterministic time homogeneous Markov process whose transition probabilities for $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_t = x \,|\, X_0 = x) &= 1 && \text{for all } x \in [0,1), \\
\mathbb{P}(X_t = x + t \,|\, X_0 = x) &= 1 && \text{for all } x \in [1,\infty) \text{ or } (x \in (-\infty, 0) \text{ and } t + x < 0), \\
\mathbb{P}(X_t = x + t + 1 \,|\, X_0 = x) &= 1 && \text{for all } x \in (-\infty, 0) \text{ and } t + x \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Incidentally, this counterexample also shows that for time homogeneous Markov processes stochastic continuity (4.1) is stronger than stochastic continuity from the right, i.e., $\lim_{t\downarrow 0} \mathbb{P}(|X_t - x| > \varepsilon \mid X_0 = x) = 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In fact the following holds.

Proposition 4.8. *Let X be a $D[0,1]$ valued process then the following are equivalent:*

i) X is stochastically continuous: $\forall s \in [0,1]\ \forall \varepsilon > 0 : \ \lim_{t\to s} \mathbb{P}(|X_t - X_s| > \varepsilon) = 0$,

ii) X has no fixed discontinuities: $\forall t \in [0,1] : \ \mathbb{P}(|X_t - X_{t-}| > 0) = 0$.

If additionally X is a time homogeneous Markov process, then i) and ii) are implied by

iii) X is locally spatial-uniformly stochastically continuous from the right:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \; \forall R > 0 : \; \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \sup_{|x|<R} \mathbb{P}(|X_t - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, X_0 = x) = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Let X be a $D[0,1]$ valued process. Then it has right continuous path with left limits and therefore i) and ii) are equivalent.

Moreover, there exists for each $\varepsilon' > 0$ an $R > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\|X\|_\infty \geq R) < \varepsilon'$. For X being a time homogeneous Markov process and $0 \leq h \leq t$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(|X_{t-h} - X_t| > \varepsilon) &= \int \mathbb{P}(|x - X_h| > \varepsilon \,|\, X_0 = x)\, \mathbb{P}(X_{t-h} \in dx) \\ &\leq \sup_{|x|<R} \mathbb{P}(|X_h - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, X_0 = x) + \varepsilon',\end{aligned}$$

which implies the result. □

Proposition 4.8 suggests that it might be possible to localize condition (4.5). In fact the following is a simple consequence of Aldous result.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $X^{(n)}$ be time homogeneous strong Markov processes satisfying* (4.2) *and*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \; \forall R > 0 : \; \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\substack{|x|<R \\ t \leq h}} \mathbb{P}(|X_t^{(n)} - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, X_0 = x) = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

then $(X^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is J_1-tight.

Proof. Let (4.2) for $\varepsilon' > 0$ and (4.7) hold, and let $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that τ_n is a stopping time for $X^{(n)}$. Furthermore, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $[0,1]$ with $t_n \to 0$. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|X^{(n)}_{(\tau_n + t_n) \wedge 1} - X^{(n)}_{\tau_n}| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \varepsilon' + \sup_{\substack{|x|<R \\ t \leq t_n}} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_t^{(n)} - x| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, X_0 = 0\right)$$

and Theorem 4.6 implies the result. □

In the following we will adapt conditions (4.2) and (4.7) to the Markov chain setting.

Let $Y^{(n)}$ be a time homogeneous Markov chain $(Y_0^{(n)}, Y_1^{(n)}, Y_2^{(n)}, \ldots)$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ and define the embeddings $X^{n,\mathcal{T}}(\omega)$ analogous to the previous section for each ω. Then each $X^{n,\mathcal{T}}$ is a $D[0,1]$-valued random variable. In general, $X^{n,\mathcal{T}}$ is not a Markov process.

Starting with a Markov chain a Markov processes can be constructed by subordination: independent of the Markov chain let $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Poisson process with intensity 1. Then one can embed the Markov chain $Y^{(n)}$ into a continuous time Markov process $\left(Z_t^{(n)}\right)_{t \geq 0}$ by setting $Z_t^{(n)} := Y^{(n)}_{N_{nt}}$ for $t \in [0,1)$ and $Z_1^{(n)} := Z_{1-}^{(n)}$. The J_1 embedding and the Markov embedding are closely related.

Lemma 4.10. *Let*

$$\sup_{k < |n - 1 - N_{n-}|} \left| Y^{(n)}_{((n-1) \wedge N_{n-}) + k} - Y^{(n)}_{(n-1) \wedge N_{n-}} \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Then X^{n,J_1} converges in distribution w.r.t. J_1 if and only if $Z^{(n)}$ converges in distribution w.r.t. J_1.

Proof. Recall that $X_t^{n,J_1} = Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}$ and $Z_t^{(n)} = Y^{(n)}_{N_{nt}}$ for $t < 1$. The first $(n-1) \wedge N_{n-}$ steps of these processes coincide by definition, they just appear at different times ($\frac{k}{n}$ vs. k-th jump time of N_{nt}). By a time change with a piecewise linear function $\lambda \in \Lambda_c$ both paths (up to the waiting time after the $(n-1)\wedge N_{n-}$-th jump) can be made to coincide. The value of $\|\lambda - id\|_\infty$ is attained at one of the jump times, thus (since $N_{n\cdot} = \lfloor n \frac{N_n \cdot}{n} \rfloor$) one can show that

$$\|\lambda - id\|_\infty = \sup_{s \in [0,1)} \left| s - \frac{N_{ns}}{n} \right|$$

holds. The steps after $(n-1) \wedge N_{n-}$ can not be compensated by a time transformation. They have to be estimated explicitly. Therefore

$$d_{J_1}\left(X_\cdot^{n,J_1}, Z_\cdot^{(n)}\right) \leq \sup_{s \in [0,1)} \left| s - \frac{N_{ns}}{n} \right| + \sup_{k < |n-1-N_{n-}|} |Y_{((n-1)\wedge N_{n-})+k} - Y_{((n-1)\wedge N_{n-})}|.$$

Since $s - \frac{N_{ns}}{n}$ is a martingale we find with Doob's maximal inequality

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \in [0,1)} \left| s - \frac{N_{ns}}{n} \right| \right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left| 1 - \frac{N_n}{n} \right| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left(1 - \frac{N_n}{n}\right)^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

This implies with (4.8) that the J_1 distance of X^{n,J_1} and $Z^{(n)}$ converges in probability to 0. Thus by Slutsky's theorem (i.e., $A^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} A$ and $|A^{(n)} - B^{(n)}| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ implies $B^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} A$) the result follows. □

Before analyzing condition (4.8) consider the question we have asked at the beginning: when does the converse of Corollary 3.1 hold. Suppose a step embedded (i.e., using the J_1-embedding of (3.2)) Markov chain converges for example in J_2 but not in J_1, then there must be too many jumps. If the process returns to the starting points of these jumps then the Markov property would imply that there are to many jumps at arbitrary times. Thus the embedded Markov chain wouldn't converge in J_2 either. But if the limit has some states which it reaches by a jump and leaves instantaneously by an other jump then it can converge in J_2 without convergence in J_1. The following condition is sufficient to ensure that such limit points do not exist:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \, \forall R > 0 : \lim_{h \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\substack{|x| < R \\ t \leq h}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn \rfloor} - x \right| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x \right) = 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Note that this is the Markov chain version of (4.7). It ensures, as (4.7), that the limit process is locally spatial-uniformly stochastically continuous from the right and together with the Markov chain version of (4.2), i.e.,

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \, \exists R > 0 : \sup_n \mathbb{P}(\|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor \cdot nm \rfloor}\|_\infty > R) < \varepsilon \tag{4.10}$$

we get a J_1-tightness condition, see Theorem 4.12. Note that in (4.10) the extra m is needed since the subordinated chain might have more than n steps. In the context of $D[0,1]$ this is not natural, but for processes in $D[0,\infty)$ the condition remains unchanged and becomes natural (cf. the last paragraph of this section). Now we can relate (4.8) to these conditions.

Lemma 4.11. *Let* (4.9) *and* (4.10) *hold. Then for any sequence* $(l(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0,\infty)$ *with* $\frac{l(n)}{n} \to 0$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{|x| < R} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k \leq l(n)} |Y_k^{(n)} - x| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x \right) = 0 \tag{4.11}$$

and (4.8) *hold.*

Proof. Let $\tau^{(n)}_{B_\varepsilon(x)}$ denote the time of the first exit of X^{n,J_1} from the ball with center x and radius ε. Then (4.11) becomes

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{|x|<R} \mathbb{P}\left(\tau^{(n)}_{B_\varepsilon(x)} < \frac{l(n)}{n} \,\middle|\, X_0^{n,J_1} = x\right) = 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Suppose that the limit in (4.12) is not zero. Then the limiting process (if it exists) would not be locally spatial-uniformly stochastically continuous from the right, and this contradicts (4.9). Hence (4.11) must hold. Alternatively, for a direct proof note that analogous to [8, Lemma 2, p. 420] one gets

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\le l(n)} |Y_k^{(n)} - x| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right) \le \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{l(n)}^{(n)} - x| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right)}{1 - \sup_{\substack{|y|<R \\ k\le l(n)}} \mathbb{P}\left(|Y_k^{(n)} - y| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = y\right) - \varepsilon_R}$$

where $\varepsilon_R \in [0,1)$ is some constant depending on R. Hence the statement follows by (4.9) and the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{|x|<R} \mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{l(n)}^{(n)} - x| > \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right) &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{|x|<R \\ t\le \frac{l(n)}{n}}} \mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{\lfloor tn\rfloor}^{(n)} - x| > \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{|x|<R \\ t\le h}} \mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{\lfloor tn\rfloor}^{(n)} - x| > \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right)\end{aligned}$$

which holds for any $h \in (0,1]$.

For the second part of the statement let $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and R such that $\mathbb{P}(\|Y_{\lfloor \cdot n(m+2)\rfloor}\|_\infty > R) < \varepsilon'$. Note that $\mathbb{P}(|n - 1 - N_{n-}| \ge \sqrt{n}m) \le \frac{1}{m}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k<|n-1-N_{n-}|} \left|Y^{(n)}_{((n-1)\wedge N_{n-})+k} - Y^{(n)}_{(n-1)\wedge N_{n-}}\right| > \varepsilon\right) \\ &\le \varepsilon' + \tfrac{1}{m} + \sup_{|x|<R} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\le\sqrt{n}m} |Y_k^{(n)} - x| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right)\end{aligned}$$

and (4.11) implies (4.8), since $\frac{\sqrt{n}m}{n} \to 0$. □

Now we can prove a J_1-tightness result for embedded Markov chains.

Theorem 4.12. *Let $Y^{(n)}$, X^{n,J_1} and X be as above. Suppose the following conditions hold:*

i) $X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{fdd} X$ *on a dense subset of* $[0,1]$,

ii) $\forall \varepsilon > 0\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N}\, \exists R > 0 :\ \sup_n \mathbb{P}(\|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor \cdot nm\rfloor}\|_\infty > R) < \varepsilon$,

iii) $\forall \varepsilon > 0\, \forall R > 0 :\ \lim_{h\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sup_{\substack{|x|<R \\ t\le h}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn\rfloor} - x\right| > \varepsilon \,\middle|\, Y_0^{(n)} = x\right) = 0.$

Then

$$X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{d} X \text{ w.r.t. } J_1.$$

Proof. Assume that the conditions hold and let $Z^{(n)}$ be the Markov embedding of $Y^{(n)}$ as defined above. By Lemma 4.10 and Lemma 4.11

$$X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{d} X \text{ w.r.t. } J_1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Z^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} X \text{ w.r.t. } J_1.$$

Next note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|Y^{(n)}_{N_{\cdot n}}\|_\infty > R) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\le N_n} |Y^{(n)}_k| > R\right) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\le l} |Y^{(n)}_k| > R\right)\mathbb{P}(N_n = l) \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{k\le nm} |Y^{(n)}_k| > R\right) + \mathbb{P}(N_n \ge mn) \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

with $\mathbb{P}(N_n \ge mn) \le \frac{1}{m}$ and condition ii) implies that $Z^{(n)}$ satisfies (4.2). Furthermore, let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then as in (4.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|Y^{(n)}_{N_{tn}} - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, Y^{(n)}_0 = x) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|Y^{(n)}_l - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, Y^{(n)}_0 = x)\mathbb{P}(N_{tn} = l) \\ &\le \sup_{l\le \lfloor tnm\rfloor} \mathbb{P}(|Y^{(n)}_l - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, Y^{(n)}_0 = x) + \frac{1}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

and condition iii) (with $h < \frac{1}{m}$) and the arbitrary choice of m imply that $Z^{(n)}$ satisfies (4.7). Thus by Theorem 4.9 the family $(Z^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is tight.

Hence, for every sequence $n_k \nearrow \infty$ there is a subsequence n_{k_l} such that $Z^{(n_{k_l})}$ converges in distribution w.r.t. J_1 to some limit, and $X^{(n_{k_l})}$ must have the same limit in distribution. But by i) the limit of $X^{(n_{k_l})}$ is X and it is independent of the sequence. Thus $X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. J_1. □

Furthermore (4.9) also yields a statement about the convergence of finite dimensional distributions when switching the embedding.

Lemma 4.13. *Let* (4.9) *hold and* $X^{n,\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{d} X$ *w.r.t.* $\mathcal{T}$*, hence (by Theorem 4.2) also* $X^{n,\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{fdd} X$ *on some* I *which is a dense subset of* $[0,1]$*. Then*

$$X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{fdd} X \text{ on } I.$$

Proof. Let the assumptions hold and note that by definition $X^{n,\mathcal{T}}_t \in [[Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn\rfloor}, Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn\rfloor+1}]]$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ then by Remark 4.3.3. there exists an $R > 0$ such that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{P}(\|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor\cdot n\rfloor}\|_\infty \ge R) < \varepsilon. \tag{4.14}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X^{n,J_1}_t - X^{n,\mathcal{T}}_t| > \varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}(|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn\rfloor} - X^{n,\mathcal{T}}_t| > \varepsilon) \\ &\le \mathbb{P}(|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn\rfloor} - Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor tn\rfloor+1}| > \varepsilon) \\ &\le \sup_{x<R} \mathbb{P}(|Y^n_1 - x| > \varepsilon \,|\, Y_0 = x) + \sup_n \mathbb{P}(\|Y^{(n)}_{\lfloor\cdot n\rfloor}\|_\infty \ge R) \end{aligned}$$

and first term on the right hand side converges by (4.9) to 0 as $n \to 0$. Since ε is arbitrary the result follows by Slutsky's theorem as in Lemma 4.10. □

Finally we get the following converse to Corollary 3.1.

Theorem 4.14. *Let* (4.9) *and* (4.10) *hold. Then* $X^{n,\mathcal{T}}$ *converges in distribution w.r.t.* $\mathcal{T}$ *if and only if* X^{n,J_1} *converges in distribution w.r.t.* J_1*.*

Proof. The direction from J_1 to the other topologies is just Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.1.

For the converse let (4.9), (4.10) hold and $X^{n,\mathcal{T}} \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. By Lemma 4.13 we get $X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{\text{fdd}} X$ on some dense subset of $[0,1]$ and hence (with Remark 4.3.3.) all conditions of Theorem 4.12 are satisfied. Therefore $X^{n,J_1} \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. J_1. □

Remark 4.15. If $(Y^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the Markov chain approximation to a Feller processes with symbol q (see [6, 4] for the definitions and further details) then (4.10) is satisfied and condition (4.9) reduces to

$$\forall R > 0 : \lim_{\xi\to 0} \sup_{|x|<R} |q(x,\xi)| = 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Thus in this case the Markov chain approximation – which is in fact nothing but the Euler scheme for the stochastic differential equation generating the Feller processes, see [5] – converges in any of the four Skorokhod topologies if we use the corresponding embeddings.

Finally we want to emphasize that condition (4.9) ensures the local spatial-uniform stochastic continuity from the right for the limit. Hence by Proposition 4.8 the limit is stochastically continuous and therefore by Remark 4.3.2. we can consider the convergence of the finite dimensional distributions on the whole interval $[0,1]$ (no exceptional times!). Furthermore, if $X^{(n)}, X$ are $D[0,\infty)$ valued processes and X is stochastically continuous, then the extension from $D[0,T]$ to $D[0,\infty)$ (compare Remark 2.8.2.) does not need a restriction of the time set (again no exceptional times!), i.e., we have (see [11, Theorem 3']):

$$X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} X \text{ w.r.t. } J_1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X^{(n)}\big|_{[0,T]} \xrightarrow{d} X\big|_{[0,T]} \text{ w.r.t. } J_1 \text{ in } D[0,T] \text{ for all } T \in (0,\infty). \tag{4.16}$$

Additionally, in this setting $X^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} X$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ implies (cf. Remark 4.3.3.) that (4.10) is satisfied.

5 Proof of Lemma 2.6

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider the triplets $(t^\varepsilon, t_1^\varepsilon, t_2^\varepsilon) \in T_1(\delta)$ such that

$$\Delta_{J_1}(\delta, f) - \varepsilon \le J(f(t^\varepsilon), f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(t_2^\varepsilon)).$$

We consider various cases:

A) If the triple can be chosen such that

$$f(t^\varepsilon) \notin [[f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(t_2^\varepsilon)]] \tag{5.1}$$

then $\Delta_{J_1}(\delta, f) - \varepsilon \le \Delta_{M_1}(\delta, f)$.

B) If the triple can be chosen such that

$$|t^\varepsilon - t_1^\varepsilon| \ge \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |t^\varepsilon - t_2^\varepsilon| \ge \frac{\delta}{2} \tag{5.2}$$

then $\Delta_{J_1}(\delta, f) - \varepsilon \le \Delta_{J_2}(\delta, f)$.

C) If (5.1) and (5.2) are not possible then

$$f(t^\varepsilon) \in [[f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(t_2^\varepsilon)]]$$

and without loss of generality

$$|t^\varepsilon - t_1^\varepsilon| < \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{5.3}$$

C1) Now suppose that t_2^ε can be chosen such that

$$|t^\varepsilon - t_2^\varepsilon| \geq \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{5.4}$$

Fix $s_1 \in [t^\varepsilon - \delta, t^\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}]$. Then

$$f(s_1) \in [[f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(t^\varepsilon)]] \tag{5.5}$$

since otherwise either $(t_1^\varepsilon, s_1, t^\varepsilon)$ satisfying (5.1) would be a valid triple or t_1^ε could be chosen such that (5.2) is satisfied. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
J(f(t^\varepsilon), f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(t_2^\varepsilon)) &= |f(t_1^\varepsilon) - f(t^\varepsilon)| \wedge |f(t^\varepsilon) - f(t_2^\varepsilon)| \\
&\leq (|f(s_1) - f(t_1^\varepsilon)| + |f(s_1) - f(t^\varepsilon)|) \wedge |f(t^\varepsilon) - f(t_2^\varepsilon)| \\
&\leq |f(s_1) - f(t_1^\varepsilon)| + |f(s_1) - f(t^\varepsilon)| \wedge |f(t^\varepsilon) - f(t_2^\varepsilon)| \\
&= |f(s_1) - f(t_1^\varepsilon)| \wedge |f(t_1^\varepsilon) - f(t^\varepsilon)| + |f(s_1) - f(t^\varepsilon)| \wedge |f(t^\varepsilon) - f(t_2^\varepsilon)| \\
&= M(f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(s_1), f(t^\varepsilon)) + J(f(t^\varepsilon), f(s_1), f(t_2^\varepsilon)) \\
&\leq \Delta_{M_1}(\delta, f) + \Delta_{J_2}(\delta, f),
\end{aligned}$$

where the two equalities are due to (5.5).

C2) If (5.4) can not be satisfied then

$$|t^\varepsilon - t_2^\varepsilon| < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Fix $s_1 \in [t^\varepsilon - \delta, t^\varepsilon - \frac{\delta}{2}]$ and $s_2 \in [t^\varepsilon + \frac{\delta}{2}, t^\varepsilon + \delta]$. Then

$$f(s_i) \in [[f(t_i^\varepsilon), f(t^\varepsilon)]] \text{ for i} = 1, 2 \tag{5.6}$$

and hence using the inequality $(a + b) \wedge (c + d) \leq b \wedge d + a \vee c$ $(a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R})$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
J(f(t^\varepsilon), f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(t_2^\varepsilon)) &\leq (|f(s_1) - f(t_1^\varepsilon)| + |f(s_1) - f(t^\varepsilon)|) \wedge (|f(s_2) - f(t_2^\varepsilon)| + |f(s_2) - f(t^\varepsilon)|) \\
&\leq |f(s_1) - f(t^\varepsilon)| \wedge |f(s_2) - f(t^\varepsilon)| + |f(s_1) - f(t_1^\varepsilon)| \vee |f(s_2) - f(t_2^\varepsilon)| \\
&= J(f(t^\varepsilon), f(s_1), f(s_2)) + (M(f(t_1^\varepsilon), f(s_1), f(t^\varepsilon)) \vee M(f(t_2^\varepsilon), f(t^\varepsilon), f(s_2))) \\
&\leq \Delta_{J_2}(\delta, f) + \Delta_{M_1}(\delta, f)
\end{aligned}$$

where (5.6) was used for the equality.

Since ε is arbitrary the result follows.

References

[1] Aldous, D. Stopping times and tightness. *The Annals of Probability*, p. 335–340, 1978.

[2] Avram, F. and Taqqu, M. Probability bounds for M-Skorohod oscillations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 33(1):63–72, 1989.

[3] Billingsley, P. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley, 1968.

[4] Böttcher, B., Schilling, R., and Wang, J. *Lévy-Type Processes: Construction, Approximation and Sample Path Properties*, Vol. 2099 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Lévy Matters*. Springer, 2013.

[5] Böttcher, B. and Schnurr, A. The Euler scheme for Feller processes. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, 29(6):1045–1056, 2011.

[6] Böttcher, B. and Schilling, R. Approximation of Feller processes by Markov chains with Lévy increments. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 9(1):71–80, 2009.

[7] Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. *Markov Processes - Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, 1986.

[8] Gikhman, I. I. and Skorokhod, A. V. *The Theory of Stochastic Processes I*. Springer, 1974.

[9] Jacod, J. and Shiryaev, A. N. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2002.

[10] Jakubowski, A. A non-Skorohod topology on the Skorohod space. *Electron. J. Probab*, 2(4):1–21, 1997.

[11] Lindvall, T. Weak convergence of probability measures and random functions in the function space $D[0, \infty)$. *Journal of Applied Probability*, p. 109–121, 1973.

[12] Meyer, P. and Zheng, W. Tightness criteria for laws of semimartingales. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 20(4):353–372, 1984.

[13] Pomarede, J. *A unified approach via graphs to Skorohod's topologies on the function space D*. PhD thesis, Yale University, 1976.

[14] Sato, K. A note on convergence of probability measures on C and D. *Ann. Sci. Kanazawa Univ*, 14:1–5, 1977.

[15] Skorokhod, A. Limit theorems for stochastic processes. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 1:261–290, 1956.

[16] Whitt, W. *Stochastic-process limits: an introduction to stochastic-process limits and their application to queues*. Springer, 2002.